REMARKS

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant has amended the claim accordingly. The process is tied into the system, i.e. the computer database.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Matsumoto et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,334).

Regarding claim 10, the Examiner states that Matsumoto discloses a method for determining which non-internet advertisements direct which web clicks to a website comprising: (abstract) advertising by an internet company through use of television, radio and or newspaper ads. Figure 1 item 15 is a database table, whereas 201 is an ad space. Col. 6 lines 45-65 relate to an agreement section 51, and providing the type of ad space to be used. This section has nothing to do with determining which non-internet advertising directs which web clicks. Col. 7, lines 15-45, relate to putting identification codes on the advertising. This way if one puts in the advertising code, one knows where the ad is coming from. The Examiner states that there is teachings in Matsumoto that teach removing from said system from said stored internet information internet traffic from links to other websites and not from direct logins to said website. Col. 8, lines 53-65, discloses storing information in the index log 62. There is no removal of any stored information taught. Col.9, lines 45-65 teaches again storing information. It then determines the origin of the response by the

call letters it gave the advertisement. Again the Examiner points to nothing in the patent which teaches removing information from the system. Col. 10, line 8 to col. 11, line 37 again discusses determining the origin of the ad by the advertisers code. This is not removal of information. Further none of these sections compares the timing and location of advertising to timing and location of when a user logs onto said internet site. The comparison from above uses the advertisers code only.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,334).

Matsumoto does teach or make obvious that the system comparing information from said first database with information from when and where the user logs into the web site to determine which of said non-internet ads generated said web clicks and providing said information to a user. Matsumoto specifically uses a specific advertisement code given to a specific advertisement to determine which advertisement directed the person to log onto the web site. There is no comparison as required by the claim.

In the present claims there is no index URL embedded in the ad, and therefore, Matsumoto does not teach the comparison required by the claims of the present invention and in fact the embedded URL make s the teachings of the inventions at opposite ends of the spectrum.

It would not have been obvious to do the comparison taught by the claims of the present invention as it would make the invention of Matsumoto obsolete if the embedded URLs were not used.

Regarding claims 2, 4-6, and 8 and 9, for the reasons stated above these claims are not obvious over the prior art.

The Examiner states that Applicants mention an index URL embedded in the ad. Examiner is not sure what point the Applicant is trying to make. All types of advertisements comprise embedded links including ads in newspapers and TV. The Examiner is missing the point of applicant's invention. In the case of applicant, there is no index URL embedded in the ad. That is why the method and system in the claims is so claimed. This information may assist the Examiner in the future examination of the patent application.

Applicant now believes the application is in condition for allowance.

"EXPRESS MAIL" Mailing Label No.
Date of Deposit: August 6, 2009
I hereby certify that this paper or fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313

Signature: Debbie Broderick
Name: Debbie Broderick

Respectfully submitted,

Philip M. Weiss
Reg. No. 34,751
Attorney for Applicant
Weiss & Weiss
300 Old Country Rd., Ste. 251
Mineola, NY 11501
516-739-1500